Mobile Relays for Smart Cities: Mathematical Proofs

Tugcan Aktas, **Giorgio Quer**, **Tara Javidi**, **Ramesh R. Rao**
University of California San Diego – La Jolla, CA 92093, USA.

arXiv:1609.01322v1 [cs.IT] 5 Sep 2016

I. Proofs for S_M under non-stopping fmBS scenario



Fig. 1. Time of arrivals of fmAPs and S_c operation for a given T2 connection round.

We first present the following two lemmas:

Lemma 1. The expectation of service time $\tau_1^{(S_c)}$ is

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1^{(S_c)}|M^{(S_c)}\geq 1\right]=\frac{\lambda T_M-\left(1-e^{-\lambda T_M}\right)}{\lambda\left(1-e^{-\lambda T_M}\right)}. \tag{1}$$

Lemma 2. The expectation of t_1 is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\left[t_1|M^{(S_c)}\geq 1\right]&=\frac{\lambda}{e^{\lambda T_M}-1}\int_0^{T_M}\frac{s_1e^{\lambda s_1}}{1-e^{\lambda s_1}}\mathrm{d}s_1-\frac{1}{\lambda}\\&=\frac{1}{\lambda\left(e^{\lambda T_M}-1\right)}\left(\mathrm{Li}_2\left(e^{\lambda T_M}\right)-\frac{\pi^2}{6}+1\right.\\&\left.+e^{\lambda T_M}\left(\lambda T_M-1\right)+\lambda T_M\log\left(1-e^{\lambda T_M}\right)\right)-\frac{1}{\lambda},\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $\mathrm{Li}_2(x)\triangleq\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{x^k}{k^2}$ is the polylogarithm function of order 2. The proofs of the these two lemmas are given consecutively.

A. Proof of Lemma 1

Let us start with the conditional pdf $f_{\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1}(s)$. For $M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=0$, we have $\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=0$, which is a trivial result. In the case $M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1$, we have $K\geq 1$ fmBS arrivals in the interval $(0,T_M]$ by taking the arrival time of the initial vehicle C_0 as our time origin. Furthermore, according to the uniform property of the Poisson arrivals, the exact arrival times of these fmBSs, namely $A_j, j\in\{1,\ldots,K\}$, are independent and distributed uniformly in $(0,T_M]$. Therefore, we have $\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=\max_{j\in\{1,\ldots,K\}}\{A_j\}$. It is known that the pdf of the maximum of k independent uniform random variables defined in $(0,T_M]$ satisfies

$$f_{\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\left|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1,K=k\right.}(s)=\frac{ks^{k-1}}{T_M^k},\quad s\in(0,T_M]\,. \tag{3}$$

Since K is a Poisson random variable with parameter λT_M and we are given that $K\geq 1$, the expectation sum over (3) yields

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1}(s)&=\sum_{k=1}^{\infty}\frac{ks^{k-1}}{T_M^k}\frac{(\lambda T_M)^k}{k!}\frac{\exp(-\lambda T_M)}{1-\exp(-\lambda T_M)}\\ &=\frac{\lambda\exp(\lambda s)}{\exp(\lambda T_M)-1},\quad s\in(0,T_M]\,, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where we make use of the definition for the probability generating function (PGF) of K. By using (4), one can evaluate the desired expected value for $\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}$ by integrating (4) over $s\in(0,T_M]$.

B. Proof of Lemma 2

Similar to proof of Lemma 1, for t_j to be different than zero, we require $K\geq 1$ arrivals in the $(0,\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=s_j]$ interval. Then, we have

$$f_{t_j|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq j+1,K=k,K\geq 1,\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=s_j}(r)=\frac{kr^{k-1}}{s_j^k},\quad r\in(0,s_j]\,. \tag{5}$$

Taking the expectation over the pmf of K with the condition $K\geq 1$, we obtain

$$f_{t_j|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq j+1,\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=s_j}(r)=\frac{\lambda\exp(\lambda r)}{\exp(\lambda s_j)-1},\quad r\in(0,s_j]\,. \tag{6}$$

The expected value of t_j, conditioned on $\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=s_j$, follows from an expectation integral of (6) over $r\in(0,s_j]$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{E}\left[t_j|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq j+1,\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=s_j\right]&=\int_0^{s_j}r\frac{\lambda\exp(\lambda r)}{\exp(\lambda s_j)-1}\mathrm{d}r\\ &=\frac{\lambda s_j-(1-\exp(-\lambda s_j))}{\lambda(1-\exp(-\lambda s_j))}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

In order to remove the condition on $\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}$ for the $j=1$ case and obtain $\mathrm{E}\left[t_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]$, we first multiply of the expressions in (7) and (4) to further integrate the resulting expression over $s_1\in(0,T_M]$, which finalizes the proof.

Theorem 1. *The expected effective ratio of time in T2 with strategy S_c can be approximated by*

$$R_2^{(S_c)}\simeq(1-P_V)-\frac{2\ (1-P_V)\,T_H}{E\left[\tau_1^{(S_c)}+t_1\middle|M^{(S_c)}\geq 1\right]+\frac{2}{\lambda}}, \tag{8}$$

where $E\left[\tau_1^{(S_c)}|M^{(S_c)}\geq 1\right]$ follows from (1) and $E\left[t_1|M^{(S_c)}\geq 1\right]$ from (2).

C. Proof of Theorem 1

For a given value $M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n$, the time intervals in which new fmBS arrivals occur are disjoint time intervals of length $\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}, t_1, t_2, \ldots, t_{n-1}$, as exemplified in Fig. 1. With an abuse of notation, we drop the superscript (S_c) in $\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}$ since for no strategy other than S_M, we deal with $\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S})}$ in the scope of this proof. Therefore, the number of unserved fmBSs, U, in a T2 round satisfies

$$\mathrm{E}\left[U|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]=\mathrm{E}\left[U^{\tau_1}+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}U^{t_j}\right],$$

where U^{τ_1} and U^{t_j} are the number of unserved fmBSs in the time intervals τ_1 and t_j, respectively. Based on the iterated expectations over these random service times, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\left[U|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]=&\mathrm{E}\left[\mathrm{E}_{U|\tau_1,t_j,M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n}\left[U^{\tau_1}+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}U^{t_j}\right]\right]\\&=\lambda\left(\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]+\sum_{j=1}^{n-1}\mathrm{E}\left[t_j|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]\right),\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where we use the fact that $\mathrm{E}\left[U^{\tau_1}|\tau_1=s_1\right]=\lambda s_1$, and a similar argument is valid for t_j as well.

We should evaluate $\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]$ and $\mathrm{E}\left[t_j|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]$ in order to remove the conditions on these random variables in (9). However, it is possible to approximate the term $\mathrm{E}\left[U|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]$ by evaluating $\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]$, and for only a few values of $\mathrm{E}\left[t_j|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq j+1\right]$. Therefore, we use

$$\mathrm{E}\left[U|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=n\right]\simeq n\lambda\frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]+\mathrm{E}\left[t_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]}{2},\tag{10}$$

where the term $\left(\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]+\mathrm{E}\left[t_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]\right)/2$ is an approximation for the average number of unserved fmBSs between two consecutive horizontal handoffs.

On the other hand, the number of handoffs for $\mathrm{S_m}$ and $\mathrm{S_c}$ in the whole T2 round satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]=\mathrm{E}_{M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}}\left[\mathrm{E}\left[U+M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\right]\right]\\&\simeq\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\right]\left(\lambda\frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]+\mathrm{E}\left[t_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]}{2}+1\right),\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

where we use (10). Solving it for $\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\right]$ in (11) we obtain

$$\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\right]\simeq\frac{2\,\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]}{\lambda\left(\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}+t_1|M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\geq 1\right]\right)+2},\tag{12}$$

where the denominator follows from the results of Lemmas 1 and 2. For $\mathrm{S_c}$, the expected effective ratio of time in T2 is

$$R_2^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}=\frac{\mathrm{E}\left[T_2\right]-\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_c)}\right]T_H}{\mathrm{E}\left[T_1\right]+\mathrm{E}\left[T_2\right]},\tag{13}$$

where $\mathrm{E}\left[T_1\right]=\lambda^{-1}$ and $\mathrm{E}\left[T_2\right]=\frac{1-P_V}{\lambda P_V}$ as for S_m [1]. The proof is completed by plugging all these known expressions and (12) into (13).

II. Proofs for S_m under stopping fmBS scenario

Lemma 3.

$$\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right] = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{m+1} \left(1 - \hat{P}_V^{(j)}\right), \tag{14}$$

where $\hat{P}_V^{(j)}$ is the probability of a vertical handoff at the end of a service time of the $(j-1)^{\text{st}}$ fmBS and is expressed as

$$\hat{P}_V^{(j)} = e^{-\lambda T_M}\left[1 - P_S\left(1 - e^{-P_S \lambda T_S}\right)\frac{1-\Delta^j}{1-\Delta}\right] \tag{15}$$

and $\Delta \triangleq (P_S' - P_S)$.

A. Proof of Lemma 3

The conditional probability that the j^{th} fmBS is a stopping one, given that the $(j-1)^{\text{st}}$ fmBS is a stopping one, is

$$P_S' \triangleq \left(1 - e^{-P_S \lambda T_S}\right) + e^{-P_S \lambda T_S}\left(1 - e^{-\lambda T_M}\right) P_S, \tag{16}$$

whereas the probability of observing a stopping one following a non-stopping one is simply P_S. Let us define the probability $P_S^{\prime(j)} \triangleq P\left\{j^{\text{th}} \text{ fmBS has stopped}\right\}$. It can be found that $P_S^{\prime(j)} = P_S \sum_{k=0}^{j} \left(P_S' - P_S\right)^k$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots$. Therefore, following several steps of derivation, one reaches the result that

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{P}_V^{(j)} &= P_S^{\prime(j-1)} \mathrm{P}\left\{N_{ns}\left(0, T_M\right] + N_s\left(0, T_M + T_S\right] = 0\right\} \\
&+ \left(1 - P_S^{\prime(j-1)}\right) \mathrm{P}\left\{N_{ns}\left(0, T_M\right] + N_s\left(0, T_M\right] = 0\right\} \\
&= P_S^{\prime(j-1)} \mathrm{P}\left\{N_{ns}\left(0, T_M\right] = 0\right\} \mathrm{P}\left\{N_s\left(0, T_M + T_S\right] = 0\right\} \\
&+ \left(1 - P_S^{\prime(j-1)}\right) \mathrm{P}\left\{N_{ns}\left(0, T_M\right] = 0\right\} \mathrm{P}\left\{N_s\left(0, T_M\right] = 0\right\} \\
&= e^{-\lambda T_M}\left[1 - P_S\left(1 - e^{-P_S \lambda T_S}\right)\frac{1-\Delta^j}{1-\Delta}\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where $N_s\left(.,.\right]$ and $N_{ns}\left(.,.\right]$ are the independent counting processes corresponding to the Poisson processes of stopping and the non-stopping fmBS arrivals as defined in [1], and $\Delta \triangleq (P_S' - P_S)$. Therefore, one can evaluate the expected value for the T2 handoffs for the stopping fmBS case utilizing S_m as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right] &= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} m \prod_{j=1}^{m} \hat{P}_V^{(m+1)} \left(1 - \hat{P}_V^{(j)}\right), \\
&= \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \prod_{j=1}^{m+1} \left(1 - \hat{P}_V^{(j)}\right),
\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

where we used the fact that for any non-negative random variable M, $\mathrm{E}\left[M\right] = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \mathrm{P}\left(M > m\right)$. Since the expression in (18) is an infinite summation, one can either directly utilize it to approximate $\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]$ by truncating the summation at a finite m value, or can model random variable $M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}$ using a new random variable M' which has the following success probabilities

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{M'}^{(1)} &= \hat{P}_V^{(1)} = e^{-\lambda T_M}\left[1 - P_S\left(1 - e^{-P_S \lambda T_S}\right)\right] \\
P_{M'}^{(m)} &= \hat{P}_V^{(2)} \\
&= e^{-\lambda T_M}\left[1 - P_S\left(1 - e^{-P_S \lambda T_S}\right)\left(1 + P_S' - P_S\right)\right],
\end{aligned}$$

where $m \geq 2$. Using this model we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right] \simeq \mathrm{E}\left[M'\right] &= \frac{1-P_{M'}^{(1)}}{P_{M'}^{(2)}} \\ &= \frac{1-e^{-\lambda T_M}\left[1-P_S\left(1-e^{-P_S\lambda T_S}\right)\right]}{e^{-\lambda T_M}\left[1-P_S\left(1-e^{-P_S\lambda T_S}\right)\left(1+P_S'-P_S\right)\right]}.\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Theorem 2. *The expected effective T2 ratio for S_m with stopping fmAPs can be approximated by*

$$\hat{R}_2^{(S_m)} \simeq \frac{\tilde{A}_2 - T_H E\left[M^{(S_m)}\right]}{E\left[\hat{T}_1\right] + \tilde{A}_2}, \tag{20}$$

where $\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}_1\right] = 1/\lambda$, $\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(S_m)}\right]$ is given in (19), and we approximate $\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}_2\right] \simeq \tilde{A}_2$, which is defined as

$$\tilde{A}_2 = T_M + P_S T_S + \mathrm{E}\left[M^{(S_m)}\right] \frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1^{(S_m)}\right] + \mathrm{E}\left[\tau_2^{(S_m)}\right]}{2}. \tag{21}$$

B. Proof of Thm. 2

The expected service time $\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]$ can be evaluated by using 4 possible combinations of the stopping property for the $(j-1)^{\text{st}}$ and the jth fmAPs and it simplifies to

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right] &= \left(1-P_S'^{(j-1)}\right)\left.\frac{1-e^{-x}\left(1+x\right)}{\lambda\left(1-e^{-x}\right)}\right|_{x=P_S\lambda T_M} \\ &+ \left(1-P_S'^{(j-1)}\frac{P_S'-P_S}{1-P_S}\right)\left.\frac{1-e^{-x}\left(1+x\right)}{\lambda\left(1-e^{-x}\right)}\right|_{x=(1-P_S)\lambda T_M} \\ &+ P_S'^{(j-1)}\frac{P_S'}{P_S}\left.\frac{1-e^{-x}\left(1+x\right)}{\lambda\left(1-e^{-x}\right)}\right|_{x=P_S\lambda(T_M+T_S)},\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where $P_S' \triangleq \left(1-e^{-P_S\lambda T_S}\right) + e^{-P_S\lambda T_S}\left(1-e^{-\lambda T_M}\right)P_S$ is the probability that an fmAP is a stopping one given that the previous one has stopped and $P_S'^{(j)} \triangleq P_S\sum_{k=0}^{j}\left(P_S'-P_S\right)^k$ is the probability that the $(j-1)^{\text{st}}$ fmAP is a stopping one.

Similar to the approximation in the proof of Thm. 1, we can approximate the expected time in T2 by using only a few of the $\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_j^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]$ terms. As an example, only by utilizing $\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}$ and $\tau_2^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}$ we reach

$$\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}_2\right] \simeq T_M + P_S T_S + \mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]\frac{\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right] + \mathrm{E}\left[\tau_2^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]}{2}, \tag{23}$$

where $\mathrm{E}\left[\tau_1^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]$ follows from (22) with $j=1$. The average time spent in T1 is not affected by the stopping fmAPs since a handoff from T1 to T2 occurs only when the next arrival is observed. Hence $\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}_1\right] = 1/\lambda$. The proof is completed when we replace $\mathrm{E}\left[T_2\right]$ in both the numerator and the denominator of (20) with the approximation for $\mathrm{E}\left[\hat{T}_2\right]$ in (23) and use the result on $\mathrm{E}\left[M^{(\mathrm{S}_m)}\right]$ from Lemma 3.

REFERENCES

[1] T. Aktas, G. Quer, T. Javidi, and R. R. Rao, "From connected vehicles to mobile relays: Enhanced wireless infrastructure for smarter cities," in *IEEE Global Communications Conference*, Dec. 2016.